REMARKS

In view of the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are un-patentable under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. The Applicants herein amend claim 1. Support for the amendment may be found in Applicants' specification at least on Page 12, Line 16 to Page 13 and FIG. 2. Several other claims are amended for consistency with amended claim 1. Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-12 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

A.   Claims 1-3 and 6-11

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 6-11 in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being un-patentable over D'Angelo, et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,539,291, issued on May 26, 2009, herein after referred to as "D'Angelo" in view of the Examiner's taking of Official Notice. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

D'Angelo teaches a translation gateway located at a customer network being used for translating messages to and from the customer network through a hostile data network using a secure connection through the hostile network. (See D'Angelo, Abstract, Column 2, Lines 43-64 and Column 3, Lines 11-63).

The Examiner's attention is directed to the fact that D'Angelo and the Examiner's taking of Official Notice, alone or in any permissible combination, fail to teach or to suggest an access architecture for real-time communications comprising an inter-architecture network in communication with a plurality of external networks utilizing a single protocol, wherein the single protocol comprises Session Initiated Protocol (SIP), wherein each one of the plurality of external networks uses a different access protocol and a plurality of border elements, each of the border elements **deployed** in the inter-architecture network and each of the border elements in communication with a respective external network of the plurality of external networks, wherein each of the border elements converts the different access protocol of the respective external network to a single protocol comprising the SIP protocol, as positively claimed by the Applicants' independent claim 1. Specifically, Applicants' independent claim 1 recites:

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. ATT-130AUS (ATT/2002-0477)

1.   An access architecture for real-time communications, comprising:

an inter-architecture network in communication with a plurality of external networks, wherein each one of said plurality of external networks uses a different access protocol;

a plurality of border elements, each of said border elements <u>deployed in said inter-architecture network</u> and each of said border elements in communication with a respective external network of said plurality of external networks, wherein each of said border elements converts said different access protocol of said respective external network to a single protocol, wherein said single protocol comprises Session Initiated Protocol (SIP); and

a plurality of call control elements, each of said call control elements deployed in said inter-architecture network. (Emphasis added).

In one embodiment, the Applicants teach an access architecture for real-time communications comprising an inter-architecture network in communication with a plurality of external networks utilizing a single protocol, wherein the single protocol comprises Session Initiated Protocol (SIP), wherein each one of the plurality of external networks uses a different access protocol and a <u>plurality of border elements, each of the border elements **deployed** in the inter-architecture network</u> and each of the border elements in communication with a respective external network of the plurality of external networks, wherein each of the border elements converts the different access protocol of the respective external network to a single protocol comprising the SIP protocol. (See e.g., Applicants' Specification, Page 15, Lines 26-30 and FIG.2). For example, the Applicants teach providing real-time communication services using a variety of media among the communicating entities or parties, which may accommodate a variety of call control protocols for establishing the communicating session. (See e.g., Applicants' Specification, Page 3, Lines 1-6).

The alleged combination (as taught by D'Angelo) fails to teach or make obvious the teachings of the Applicants' disclosure because D'Angelo fails to teach or suggest an access architecture for real-time communications comprising an inter-architecture network in communication with a plurality of external networks utilizing a single protocol, wherein the single protocol comprises Session Initiated Protocol (SIP), wherein each one of the plurality of external networks uses a different access protocol and a <u>plurality of border elements, each of the border elements **deployed** in the inter-architecture network</u> and each of the border elements in communication with a respective external

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. ATT-130AUS (ATT/2002-0477)

network of the plurality of external networks, wherein each of the border elements converts the different access protocol of the respective external network to a single protocol comprising the SIP protocol. D'Angelo teaches <u>a translation gateway located</u> <u>**in a customer network**</u> being used for translating messages to and from the customer network through a hostile data network using a secure connection through the hostile network. (See D'Angelo, Column 3, Lines 11-18, 28-63). Specifically, D'Angelo teaches <u>translation gateways located **in the customer network**</u>. (See D'Angelo, Column 3, Lines 28-32). The Applicants' disclosure teaches <u>border elements deployed</u> <u>in the service provider's network converting the different access protocols to a single</u> <u>protocol</u>. The Applicants' teaching advantageously enables sharing of the resources (border elements) that perform the conversion functionality. In stark contrast, D'Angelo teaches each customer having to deploy a translating gateway. Therefore, D'Angelo clearly fails to teach or make obvious the Applicants' independent claim 1.

Furthermore, the Official Notice asserted by the Examiner fails to close the significant gap left by D'Angelo, because the Official Notice also fails to teach or suggest an access architecture for real-time communications comprising an inter-architecture network in communication with a plurality of external networks utilizing a single protocol, wherein the single protocol comprises Session Initiated Protocol (SIP), wherein each one of the plurality of external networks uses a different access protocol and a <u>plurality of border elements, each of the border elements **deployed** in the inter-</u> <u>architecture network</u> and each of the border elements in communication with a respective external network of the plurality of external networks, wherein each of the border elements converts the different access protocol of the respective external network to a single protocol comprising the SIP protocol. The Applicants respectfully contend that what is known in the arts is providing real-time communications services using specific technologies that have their own call control services. (See e.g., Applicants' Specification, Page 1, Lines 26-30). Therefore, the Official Notice asserted by the Examiner fails to close the significant gap left by D'Angelo. However, in order to further clarify teaching, the Applicants have amended the independent claim 1 reciting <u>border elements **deployed** in the inter-architecture network</u>. Thus, for all of the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully contend that claim 1 of the present disclosure is not

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. ATT-130AUS (ATT/2002-0477)

made obvious by the combination of D'Angelo and the Official Notice asserted by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully challenge the Examiner's taking of Official Notice. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner provide specific support for the Official Notice.

Moreover, dependent claims 2-3 and 6-11 depend from independent claim 1 and recite additional limitations. As such, and for the exact same reason set forth above with regard to the independent claim 1 being patentable over D'Angelo and the Official Notice asserted by the Examiner, the Applicants submit that claims 2-3 and 6-11 are also patentable over D'Angelo and the Official Notice asserted by the Examiner. As such, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

B. Claims 4 and 5

The Examiner rejected claims 4 and 5 in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being un-patentable over D'Angelo in view of Baum et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0211839, published on November 13, 2003. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Baum teaches methods and an apparatus for providing emergency telephone service to IP-Based telephone users. For purposes of servicing emergency calls a telephone number is associated with each edge router port used to provide IP service to a customer premise location. (See Baum, Abstract).

The Examiner's attention is directed to the fact that D'Angelo and Baum, alone or in any permissible combination, fail to teach or to suggest an access architecture for real-time communications comprising an inter-architecture network in communication with a plurality of external networks utilizing a single protocol, wherein the single protocol comprises Session Initiated Protocol (SIP), wherein each one of the plurality of external networks uses a different access protocol and a plurality of border elements, each of the border elements **deployed** in the inter-architecture network and each of the border elements in communication with a respective external network of the plurality of external networks, wherein each of the border elements converts the different access

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. ATT-130AUS (ATT/2002-0477)

protocol of the respective external network to a single protocol comprising the SIP protocol, as positively claimed by the Applicants' independent claim 1. (See *Supra*.).

As discussed above, the alleged combination (as taught by D'Angelo) fails to teach or make obvious the teachings of the Applicants' disclosure because D'Angelo fails to teach or suggest an access architecture for real-time communications comprising an inter-architecture network in communication with a plurality of external networks utilizing a single protocol, wherein the single protocol comprises Session Initiated Protocol (SIP), wherein each one of the plurality of external networks uses a different access protocol and a <u>plurality of border elements, each of the border elements</u> **<u>deployed</u>** <u>in the inter-architecture network</u> and each of the border elements in communication with a respective external network of the plurality of external networks, wherein each of the border elements converts the different access protocol of the respective external network to a single protocol comprising the SIP protocol.

Furthermore, Baum fails to close the significant gap left by D'Angelo because Baum also fails to teach or suggest an access architecture for real-time communications comprising an inter-architecture network in communication with a plurality of external networks utilizing a single protocol, wherein the single protocol comprises Session Initiated Protocol (SIP), wherein each one of the plurality of external networks uses a different access protocol and a <u>plurality of border elements, each of the border elements</u> **<u>deployed</u>** <u>in the inter-architecture network</u> and each of the border elements in communication with a respective external network of the plurality of external networks, wherein each of the border elements converts the different access protocol of the respective external network to a single protocol comprising the SIP protocol. Baum appears to teach that the edge routers are each coupled to a network using identical protocols. (See Baum, FIG. 1; para. [0057] – [0061]). Therefore, Baum fails to close the significant gap left by D'Angelo. Thus, for all of the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully contend that claim 1 is not made obvious by the combination of D'Angelo and Baum.

Moreover, dependent claims 4 and 5 depend from independent claim 1 and recite additional limitations. As such, and for the exact same reason set forth above with regard to the independent claim 1 being patentable over D'Angelo and Baum, the

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. ATT-130AUS (ATT/2002-0477)

Applicants submit that claims 4 and 5 are also patentable over D'Angelo and Baum. As such, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Thus, the Applicants submit that all of these claims now fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring the issuance of a final rejection in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Kin-Wah Tong, Esq. at (732) 842-8110 Ext. 130 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

December 1, 2009

Wall & Tong, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702

Kin-Wah Tong, Attorney
Reg. No. 39,400
(732) 842-8110 Ext. 130